SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS			DEFENDANTS		
AMANDA BURNHAM			NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff			County of Residence of	of First Listed Defendant	••••••••••
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, Telephone Number and Email Address) Craig Thor Kimmel, Esquire				D CONDEMNATION CASES, U INVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C. 30 E. Butler Pike			Attorneys (If Known)		
Ambler, PA 19002					
(215) 540-8888 II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	EVON		TIZENCIUD OF D	THE PARTY OF THE P	
	13 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) P	TF DEF 1	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	J 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citize	n of Another State	2	
	(material in term in)		n or Subject of a 💢	3 7 3 Foreign Nation	□ 6 □ 6
	Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
CONTRACT	TORTS EDSONAL INTERV DEDSONAL INTERV		RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
□ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment □ 151 Medicare Act □ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) □ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits □ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 196 Franchise □ REAL PROPERTY □ 210 Land Condemnation □ 220 Foreclosure □ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment □ 240 Torts to Land □ 245 Tort Product Liability □ 290 All Other Real Property	ERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane Product Liability	G20	O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug O Other Food & Drug O Other Food & Drug O Trug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 O Liquor Laws O R.R. & Truck O Airline Regs. O Occupational O Cocupational O Cocupational O Other LABOR O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act O Railway Labor Act O Other Labor Litigation O Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION O Naturalization Application Habeas Corpus Other Immigration Actions	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 □ PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark □ 840 Trademark □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) □ FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only) (Place an "X" in On					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you at 15 U.S.C SECTION 1692	re filing (E	Oo not cite jurisdictiona	al statutes unless diversity):	# ±
	Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices Ad	ct			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	v DE	EMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	if demanded in complaint:
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER					
Explanation:					
DATE	SIGNATURE O	FATTOR	NEY OF RECORD		
02/05/12					

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNS assignment to appropriate calendar.	YLVANIA — DESIGNATION FOR	M to be used by counsel to indicate	the category of the case for the purpose of		
Address of Plaintiff: 3244 Kes	WICK Rd. Balt	1more, MD:	21211		
Address of Defendant: 507 PW	dential Rd.	Horsham F	7A 19044		
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:					
	(Use Reverse Side	e For Additional Space)			
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental	corporate party with any parent corporate	• • • •	10		
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement	Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P.	7.1(a))	Yes No Z		
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation poss	sibilities?		Yes□ No.		
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:			,		
Case Number:	Judge	Date Terminated:			
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answer	ed to any of the following questions:				
1. Is this case related to property included in an e	arlier numbered suit pending or within	one year previously terminated action			
2. Donathi, and involved a service of Control			Yes□ No		
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact of action in this court?	grow out of the same transaction as a	prior suit pending or within one year	previously terminated		
			Yes Note		
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringen	nent of a patent already in suit or any ea	· -			
terminated action in this court?		•	Yes No No		
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corp	us, social security appeal, or pro se civ	il rights case filed by the same individ	lual?		
		,	Ycs□ No□		
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	Washington Allahamina and Allahamina				
A. Federal Question Cases:	reat and All Other Contracts	B. Diversity Jurisdiction			
 □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Cont □ FELA 	ract, and An Other Contracts		ontract and Other Contracts		
3. ☐ Jones Act-Personal Injury		2. ☐ Airplane Pers	• •		
4. □ Antitrust		3. ☐ Assault, Defa			
5. □ Patent		4. ☐ Marine Perso	• •		
		5. □ Motor Vehic	• •		
6. □ Labor-Management Relations			. □ Other Personal Injury (Please		
7 D Civil Diches		•	pecify)		
7. □ Civil Rights8. □ Habeas Corpus		7. Products Liab	•		
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases			8. Products Liability — Asbestos		
10. □ Social Security Review Cases		9. L. All other Div	9. ☐ All other Diversity Cases		
11. X All other Federal Question Cases			(Please specify)		
(Please specify)	15 v.S.C. \$ 169	\mathcal{A}			
	ARBITRATION C	ERTIFICATION			
I Chaiathar Kim	(Check Appropri	ate Category) v certify:			
□ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3			in this civil action case exceed the sum of		
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;					
Relief other than monetary damages is soug	;nt.				
DATE: <u>US US IQ</u>			51100		
NOTE: A	Attorney-at-Law trial de novo will be a trial by jury only	if there has been compliance with F.I	Attorney I.D.# R.C.P. 38.		
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case	is not related to any case new nondi-	ng ar within and year proviously to	rminated action in this court		
except as noted above.	and remarks to any case now pendin	ne or minim one year previously ter	mmated action of this court		
03/05/12	/		571170		
DATE: US IN	Attorney-at-Law		Attorney I D #		

CIV. 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM AMANA : CIVIL

CIVIL ACTION

E-Mail Address

v. :					
NCO FINANCIAI SYSTEMS, INC. NO.					
In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.					
SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:					
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	()				
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.	()				
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.	X				
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.	()				
(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)					
	()				
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.	()				
Date Craigthor Kimmel Amanga Burn Attorney-at-law Attorney for	<u>ha</u> m				
215 540 8888 877-788-2864 KIMMERE Crea	itlaw.com				

FAX Number

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Telephone

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

AMANDA BURNHAM,)
Plaintiff)
v.	Case No.:
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
Defendant) JURY TRIAL)
) (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

COMPLAINT

AMANDA BURNHAM ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. §227 et seq. (hereinafter the "TCPA").

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- 3. Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.

4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Baltimore, Maryland 21211.
- 6. Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 8. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt of another person and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in its attempts to collect a debt of another person.
- 11. Upon information and belief, the debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
 - 12. Plaintiff does not owe the debt that Defendant was attempting to collect.
- 13. Plaintiff did not consent to the placement of collection calls to her cellular telephone by Defendant.
- 14. Further, Plaintiff never expressly consented to the placement of telephone calls to her cellular telephone by the use of an automatic telephone dialing system or artificial voice prior to Defendant's placement of the calls.

- 15. Beginning in or around November 2011, and continuing through February 2012, Defendant continuously and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff on her cellular telephone in its attempts to collect a debt of another person.
- 16. Plaintiff regularly received collection calls from the following telephone numbers: (800) 735-6588 and (800) 728-3346, which the undersigned has confirmed are telephone numbers belonging to Defendant.
- 17. When contacting Plaintiff, Defendant used an automatic telephone dialing system or a pre-recorded or artificial voice to place telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone.
- 18. None of Defendant's telephone calls placed to Plaintiff were for "emergency purposes," as specified in 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(1)(A).
- 19. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, two (2) times a day, sometimes calling as frequently as four (4) times a day.
 - 20. As a result, Plaintiff received more than ten (10) collection calls a week.
- 21. Desiring to stop the collection calls, in November 2011, Plaintiff contacted Defendant and instructed them to stop calling her.
- 22. Defendant's representative advised Plaintiff that, "[NCO] did not have any record of her owing a debt," and deceptively claimed that they would remove her name from its call list.
- 23. Instead of removing her name from its call list, Defendant continued to contact Plaintiff regarding the debt of another person.
- 24. Over the next three months, Plaintiff called Defendant on approximately seven (7) separate occasions to inform Defendant it was calling the wrong person and to remove her name from its call list.

- 25. For example, Plaintiff contacted Defendant on December 19, 2011 (twice); December 31, 2011; January 11, 2012; January 12, 2012; January 16, 2012; and February 7, 2012, each time informing Defendant that she was not the person they were looking for, to stop calling her and to remove her number from its call list.
- 26. However, each time Defendant ignored Plaintiff's instructions and continued to contact her, calling her on: December 19, 2011; December 23, 2011; December 28, 2011; December 29, 2011; December 31, 2011; January 3, 2012; January 5, 2012; January 10, 2012; January 11, 2012; January 12, 2012; January 17, 2012; January 25, 2012; January 26, 2012; February 2, 2012; February 6, 2012; February 7, 2012; and February 10, 2012.
- 27. Defendant failed to investigate or verify contact information prior to and after calling Plaintiff.
 - 28. Defendant failed to update its records to avoid further harassment of Plaintiff.
- 29. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of her privacy, as it was inconvenient for Plaintiff to receive repetitive debt collection calls on her cellular telephone for another person, especially after having informed Defendant that it was calling the wrong person and that she did not want to receive its collection calls.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 30. In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:
 - a. Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA when it communicated with

16

19

21

Plaintiff at a time or place that it knew or should have known was inconvenient;

- c. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed of abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;
- d. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff;
- e. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA when it used false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt; and
- f. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt.

COUNT II DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

- Plaintiff hereby incorporates all facts and allegations specified in all preceding 31. paragraphs by reference, as if fully set forth at length.
- 32. Section 227(b)(3)(A) of the TCPA authorizes a private cause of action for a person or entity to bring in an appropriate court of that state "an action based on a violation of this subsection or the regulations prescribed under this subsection to enjoin such violation."
- 33. Section 227(b)(3)(B), of the Act authorizes a private cause of action for a person or entity to bring in an appropriate court of that state "an action to recover for actual monetary loss from such a violation, or to receive \$500 in damages for each such violation, whichever is greater."

- 34. A non-debtor has a vastly greater privacy interest from debt collection telephone calls to a cellular telephone than an individual who is a debtor. Watson v. NCO Group Inc., 462 F.Supp. 2d 641 (E.D. Pa. 2006).
- 35. Despite the fact that Plaintiff is a non-debtor who never consented to Defendant making calls to his cellular phone, Defendant repeatedly placed non-emergency calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone without Plaintiff's consent.
- 36. Defendant's conduct violated § 227(b)(1)(A)(iii) of the TCPA by making any call using any automatic telephone dialing system or an artificial prerecorded voice to a cellular telephone for non-emergency purposes, without the prior express consent of the called party, unless the call is initiated for emergency purposes.
- 37. The Act also authorizes the Court, in its discretion, to award up to three (3) times the actual damages sustained for violations.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, AMANDA BURNHAM, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutor y damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3);
- d. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each violation of the TCPA, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(c)(5)(B); and
- e. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

Case 2:12-cv-01143-TJS Document 1 Filed 03/05/12 Page 10 of 10

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, AMANDA BURNHAM, demands a jury trial in

this case.

6 Date: 03 05 12

RESPECTFULLY/SUBMITTED,

By: _

Craig Thor Kimmel
Attorney ID No. 57100
Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.
30 E. Butler Pike

Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel(

kimmel@creditlaw.com